DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 266 813 JC 860 092

AUTHOR Young, Frank
TITLE Transfer Education: San Mateo County Community College District. Board Report Numbers 85-4-1C and 85-12-2C.
INSTITUTION San Mateo Community Coll. District, Calif.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *College Transfer Students; Community Colleges; *Enrollment Trends; Grade Point Average; High School Graduates; Questionnaires; School Surveys; *Student Characteristics; Student Educational Objectives; *Transfer Programs; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students

ABSTRACT

In 1984, a study was conducted in the San Mateo County Community College District (SMCCCD) to examine the state of transfer education in the district. During the first phase of the study, available data were gathered and examined with respect to: (1) flow of district transfers to the University of California (UC) and California State University (CSU) systems; (2) comparison of decline in San Mateo County high school seniors with decline in SMCCCD transfers to UC and CSU; (3) fall transfers to UC and CSU contributed by each SMCCCD campus; (4) ethnic distribution of UC and CSU transfers and district freshmen age 19 and under; (5) first-year academic performance of district transfers to CSU and UC; and (6) number of county high school graduates, 1970 to 1983. During the second phase of the study, a survey was conducted to identify SMCCCD students who planned to transfer to a four-year college or university and to determine when and where they intended to transfer. The survey, which was completed by 2,983 spring 1985 SMCCCD students, solicited information on selected student characteristics, including age, sex, ethnicity, district units completed, hours working, full-/part-time status, degree aspirations, intended four-year major, previous four-year college experience, and major reasons for attending a community college prior to transfer. Of the students surveyed, 76% intended to transfer, with the majority of the transfer aspirants (64%) planning to attend a CSU campus. The survey instrument is appended. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED266813

TRANSFER EDUCATION:
SAN MATEO COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

BOARD REPORT NUMBERS 85-4-1C AND 85-12-2C

Frank Young
Staff Assistant
Districtwide Transfer Committee

JC 860 092

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Stiff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

San Mateo County Community College District April 24, 1985

BOARD REPORT NO. 85-4-1C

TO: Members of the Board of Trustees

FROM: Glenn P. Smith, Chancellor-Superintendent

TRANSFER EDUCATION - PHASE I SUMMARY

Beginning with the statewide decline of transfer students in 1981, an enormous amount of emphasis has been placed on the community college transfer function. In an effort to separate fact from fiction and to examine the current state of transfer education in our own District, the Chancellor appointed a Districtwide Transfer Committee in fall of 1984. The Committee is composed of the following members:

Cañada College	College of San Mateo	Skyline College
David Eakin	Douglas Crawford	Elizabeth Armstrong
John Friesen	Josue Hoyos	Cynthia Marshall
Joseph Marchi	Anita Fisher	Suzanne Stevens

The Committee is chaired by Robert Stiff, Executive Dean, Cañada College. Frank Young, College of San Mateo, acts as Staff to the Committee for purposes of research and data collection.

The Committee held its first meeting on February 14, 1985, at which time Chancellor Smith provided the formal charge to the Committee, which is to compile all relevant data in connection with the District transfer function and to make recommendations, if necessary, to strengthen transfer education. The results of Phase I work, data regarding the transfer issue, are summarized in the remainder of the report.

It is important to look first at the transfer issue from a statewide perspective. The Board of Governors has selected transfer education as one of its major priorities for examination during 1984-85. As a part of that review, the State Chancellor's staff examined the existing information on transfer education, working with University of California, California State University, CPEC and community college personnel to identify the pertinent transfer functions and to assess all the available data. In late October 1984, the Chancellor's Office made available a report which summarized most of the information available and made a number of observations about the work of community colleges in regards to transfer education. The major points are the following:

- California community colleges transferred between 60,000 and 70,000 students to four-year institutions of post-secondary education in 1983-84.

- Over the past two decades the number of community college students transferring to UC and CSU has fluctuated because of changes in factors largely outside the colleges' control: numbers of high school graduates and college full-time enrollment; transfer admission requirements of the four-year institutions; the military draft; student preferences; and student financial aid.

- "Rates" of transfer are not accurately measured at present. However, using younger, full-time enrollment as a proxy for the potential pool of transfer students, community college transfer rates to UC and CSU have not changed appreciably in recent years.

- Using first-time, full-time, less than 25-year-old enrollment as a proxy for the potential pool, community colleges transfer about 3 of every 5 potential transfer students within 2 years after their initial lower-division enrollment. (In our District, full-time students, i.e., students taking more than 12 units, constituted 25.5% of the District student population in fall, 1984).

- In fall 1983, 35,600 students transferred from community colleges to UC and CSU, while 38,400 students "transferred" from UC and CSU to community colleges. One of every five community college students previously attended a four-year college or university.

- Minority transfer students, under-represented among transfers, increased slightly in 1982 and 1983 because of demographic changes and, apparently, also because of special efforts by certain colleges.

- The performance of community college transfer students at UC and CSU has been consistent over the past decade. Those transfer students who were not originally four-year eligible out of high school do as well as those (natives) who enroll at UC or CSU as freshmen.

- While fewer of those who were not originally four-year eligible persist in UC upper division, those who do persist receive grades nearly as high (close to 3.0 GPA) as those received by native and transfer students who were originally eligible.

It is important to point out that there are some major difficulties involved in gathering information about transfer education that make it hard to draw sound conclusions. For example, virtually nothing is known about the numbers or performance of community college transfer students who transfer to in-state private colleges or out-of-state institutions. Although this information is difficult to obtain, it would be an extremely useful adjunct to information from UC and CSU.

At the present time, not only is there no agreement as to what constitutes a potential transfer student, but also a transferring student is defined differently by UC and CSU. UC looks at the college where the majority of prior work has been accomplished, while CSU looks at the college of last attendance for its determination. More complete information on the performance of transfer students at UC and CSU would be helpful; for example, little is known about their work after the first year in upper division. Little is known about the views of those students who have transferred regarding the sufficiency of their community college lower-division experience. Also, we know little about the differences between the performance of transfer students admitted under special criteria as opposed to those admitted under regular criteria (the limited evidence which is available suggests that there are substantial differences). There needs to be more study of the impact of financial aid on transfer as well as on the importance of impacted programs as a possible barrier to transfer. In spite of all these difficulties, the information contained in the Appendix should provide a useful update on the flow of District students to CSU and UC and their academic performance at those institutions.

The Phase II work of the Committee has begun and will be completed and presented to the Chancellor and Board by June 30, 1985. The Committee has identified particular areas of the transfer function for special concentration: counseling and advisement; articulation activities and agreements; identification and retention of potential transfer students; effectiveness of remediation; increasing the transfer of under-represented students; the delivery of general education; the relationship between occupational and transfer education; and the publicizing of transfer programs and performance.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1

Flow of District Transfers to UC and CSU

Fall 1977 - Fall 1983[a]

	District Transfers			All CC Transfers		
	UC	CSU		UC	CSU	
1977	205	1,079		6,392	33,931	(51,159)[c]
1979	189	888	(1,436)[b]	5,654	30,458	(46,326)
1981	152	858	(1,263)	4,767	29,991	(45,283)
1982	153	882		5,130	29,806	
1983	159	853		5,305	30,274	
1977-1983	858	4,560		27,248	154,460	

[a] Source: CPEC, Update of CC Transfer Statistics-Fall '83, Appendix A

[b] Full-year transfers to CSU. Source: CSU Sacramento Office of School and College Relations, California Community Transfers to CSU, 1980-81, 1981-82 College Years

[c] Full-year transfers. Source: Same as in (a) above

TABLE 2

Comparison of Decline in Number of San Mateo County High School Seniors with Decline in District Transfers to UC and CSU

High School Graduates		Decline in Fall District Transfers			
Period	Decline	Period	UC	CSU	UC and CSU
1977-81	22.3%	1979-83	15.9%	3.9%	6.1%

TABLE 3

Flow of District Transfers to Selected CSU Campuses

Fall 1977, 1979, 1982, 1983

Fall Term	SF	SJ	Hay	Sac	Chi	SLO	SD	Other	Total
1977[a]	416 38.6%	271 25.1%	76 7.0%	-	60 6.5%	-	70 5.6%	186 17.2%	1079
1979[a]	386 43.5%	168 18.9%	64 7.2%	41 4.6%	52 5.9%	33 3.7%	63 7.1%	81 9.1%	888
1982[b]	356 40.4%	179 20.3%	83 9.4%	62 7.0%	53 6.0%	27 3.1%	43 4.9%	79 9.0%	882
1983[b]	366 42.9%	147 17.2%	76 8.9%	69 8.1%	60 7.0%	34 4.0%	37 4.3%	64 7.5%	853

[a] Source: CSU Sacramento, Office of School and College Relations, 1980

[b] Source: CSU Sacramento, Office of School and College Relations, 1982, 1983 (Data excerpted from 1982-1983 Statistical Report #8, Origin of Fall Term Enrollment, Division of Institutional Research, CSU Chancellor's Office, Long Beach, Ca.)

TABLE 4

Fall Transfers to UC and CSU Contributed by

Each District Campus

	UC		CSU	
District Campus	1979[a]	1983[b]	1979[a]	1983[b]
CSM	69%	69%	54%	64%
Skyline	12%	13%	27%	19%
Canada	19%	18%	19%	17%

[a] Source: CSU Sacramento, Office of School and College Relations, 1980

[b] Source: CPEC, Ad Hoc Committee on Community College Transfer, Information Item, Appendix A, Fall 1983

TABLE 5

Ethnic Distribution of District Freshmen Age 19 and Under (Fall 1981) and Transfer Students to UC and CSU (Fall 1983)

Campus	Group	Total (N)	Ethnicity (in Percents)			
			Asian	Black	Chicano	White
District	Freshmen	3,745	5.3	7.3	9.1	75.0
	CSU Trans.	853	9.0	3.6	7.5	77.1
	UC Trans.	159	11.3	2.5	7.5	76.7
All CC's	Freshmen	105,271	4.1	10.1	16.7	65.5
	CSU Trans.	30,274	9.3	6.6	9.7	72.0
	UC Trans.	5,305	12.0	4.2	8.9	73.1

Source: CPEC, Update of CC Transfer Statistics - Fall 1983, Appendix B

TABLE 6

First Year CSU Academic Performance of District Transfers
1982-83 Academic Year

CSU Campus	District Transfers Number[a]	GPA	GPA of CSU Natives	First-Year Persistence(%) of District Transfers
Chico	30	2.70	2.67	79.4
Hayward	45	2.67	2.73	76.6
Sacramento	39	2.84	2.84	84.8
San Diego	27	2.44	2.54	77.4
San Fran.	215	2.70	2.74	76.8
San Jose	88	2.84	2.73	77.6
San Luis Ob.	18	2.89	2.71	94.7
SYSTEM-WIDE	501	2.72	2.66	78.0[b]

[a] Number of regular admit District transfers who enrolled in Fall 1982 and were still enrolled in Fall 1983

[b] The first-year persistence rate of all Fall 1982 CC transfers was 73.0%

TABLE 7

First Year Academic Performance of CSM Transfers to UC
Entering Fall 1983

UC Campus	CSM Transfers[a] Number	CSM Transfers[a] UC GPA	All CC Transfers UC GPA	CSM Spring '84 Completers
Berkeley	38	2.80	2.84	97.4%
Davis	26	2.80	2.75	92.3%
Irvine	3	3.14	2.79	66.7%
Los Angeles	9	2.61	2.71	88.9%
San Diego	6	3.14	2.90	66.7%
Santa Barbara	18	2.78	2.68	94.4%
SYSTEM-WIDE	100	2.80	2.76	89.0%[b]

[a] Includes both transfers originally eligible to enter UC directly from high school and those who were originally ineligible. Eligible transfer student GPA at UC compares quite favorably with the GPA of UC natives who became juniors. For example, in the academic year 1982-83, the GPAs of UC natives, CC eligibles (23%), and CC ineligibles (77%), were 2.96, 2.92 and 2.67, respectively. Source: Transfer Education, Analytical Studies Unit, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, Oct 1984, page 27.

[b] The persistence shown here is particularly encouraging when it is realized that "about 20% of a given (UC Berkeley) freshman class is no longer enrolled by the beginning of its third year." Source: OSR Short Report, Office of Student Research, UC Berkeley, 12/10/84.

TABLE 8

San Mateo County High School Graduates[a]

Year	Graduates
1970	8117
1971	8192
1972	8446
1973	7786
1974	7754
1975	7923
1976	7724
1977	7346
1978	6973
1979	6567
1980	6320
1981	5705
1982	5674
1983	5533

[a] Source: E. T. Nielsen, San Mateo County Office of Education, 3/7/85.

San Mateo County Community College District December 4, 1985

BOARD REPORT NO. 85-12-2C

TO: Members of the Board of Trustees

FROM: Glenn P. Smith, Chancellor-Superintendent

TRANSFER EDUCATION SURVEY

A Districtwide Transfer Education Committee was formed in February, 1985. The results of the Committee's work have been reported to the Board on two occasions. In April the Board was presented with information relative to the performance of District transfer students at UC and CSU campuses.

Phase II recommendations for strengthening the transfer function within the District were presented as information to the Board on July 10, 1985. These recommendations are now being reviewed by the appropriate college and District staff and will be presented in prioritized order for Board approval.

The following report was prepared by Frank Young, College of San Mateo, who functioned as Research Assistant to the Committee, and is a response to the CPEC recommendation for early identification of transfer students. The purpose of the survey was to identify and gain a profile of those students who plan to transfer to a four-year college or university and to determine when and where they intend to transfer.

INTRODUCTION

Recently, there has been strong concern about the efficacy of the community college transfer function. This concern has focused primarily upon (1) the declining number of community college transfer students to campuses of the University of California (UC) and the California State Universities (CSU) and (2) the UC and CSU academic performance of these transfers. The final report (due in February 1986) of the Master Plan Review Commission of Higher Education will, no doubt, include an analysis of the community college transfer function.

The San Mateo County Community College District initiated a study of its own transfer function in February of 1985. A District-wide committee was formed and directed to review all data relevant to the District transfer function and to make recommendations for its improvement. The committee responded to its charge in two phases. In Phase I, the committee gathered all available information, relative to the characteristics, distribution, and academic performance of its transfer students at UC and CSU campuses. A summary of the committee's Phase I findings were presented to the Board of Trustees last April (Board Report No. 85-4-1C). The summary provided data on the number and ethnic distribution of District transfers at UC and CSU

campuses and analyzed the academic performance of these transfer students relative to that of all community college transfers and all undergraduate native students. The Phase I summary also demonstrated that the decline in the number of District transfer students has been significantly less than would be anticipated from the precipitous decline in the number of San Mateo County high school graduates.

The major Phase II activities of the transfer committee were (1) to make recommendations which would strengthen the District transfer function and (2) to respond to CPEC's recommendation for early identification of potential transfer students. In its March 1985 report: Reaffirming California's Commitment to Transfer, CPEC recommended that community college students be identified as soon as possible so that these students could be given appropriate counseling and guidance in their efforts to matriculate to UC or CSU campuses. In response to this recommendation, the transfer committee designed a survey questionnaire (see Appendix A) which was administered to Spring 1985 District students enrolled in day English or math classes. A total of 2983 District students completed the survey, the primary purpose of which was to identify those students who planned to transfer to a four-year college or university and to determine when and where they intended to transfer. The survey also sought to identify various profiles of the transfer students, including age; sex; ethnicity; District units completed; hours working; full or part-time status; AA or AS degree aspirations; intended four-year major; previous four-year college experience; and major reasons for attending a community college prior to transfer.

METHODOLOGY

The survey questionnaire designed by the transfer committee was pretested in three College of San Mateo math classes. After minor modification, the questionnaire was subsequently administered to District students who were enrolled in Spring 1985 day English and math classes. The survey responses were keypunched and statistically analyzed using the District's IBM 4381 computer. Prior to this analysis, however, the data were computer-sorted and scanned for duplicate entries (which arose when students inadvertently completed the questionnaire in more than one class). After all duplicate entries had been eliminated, SPSS subprogram FREQUENCIES was applied to the data to obtain the various student profiles referred to above. SPSS subprogram CROSSTABS provided a cross-tabulation by District campus of student age, ethnicity, Spring 1985 units taken, AA or AS degree aspirations, transfer intentions, and prior attendance at a four-year college or university. For students who indicated an intent to transfer, further cross-tabulations were obtained of the type of four-year school (UC, CSU, private California college or university, or out-of-state) to which the student intended to transfer by District campus; the student's expected year of transfer and intended four-year major by type of four-year institution; and 1985 semester units by student age, hours working, and transfer plans. Chi-square analyses of the cross-tabulations indicated their statistical significance. After all statistical analyses were completed, the data were further sorted to obtain lists of all students transferring to each type of four-year school.

FINDINGS

Student Profiles

Of the 2983 District students who completed the survey, 61% were enrolled at CSM, 23% at Skyline College and 16% at Canada College. Forty-two percent of the surveys were completed by students enrolled in a math class; 71% of these students were enrolled in CSU transferrable math courses (intermediate algebra or above). Of those District students who completed the survey in an English class, 57% were enrolled in college-level English courses (English 100 or above). A surprisingly large percentage (73%) of the respondents were under 23 years of age; only 34% of all Spring 1985 District students were in this age category. Similarly, 51% of the survey respondents were male as compared to 43% of all Spring 1985 District students. The ethnic distribution of the survey respondents revealed (See Table 1.) that the percent of Asian students in day English and math classes is about twice their percentage of all District students and of all Fall 1984 District transfers to UC and CSU campuses. Hispanic students were over-represented among the respondents to a somewhat lesser degree, while Caucasian students were under-represented. The numbers of Black students among survey respondents, all District students, and all Fall 1984 District transfers were within two percent of each other. Perhaps the most revealing statistic associated with the survey respondents was that two-thirds of them were taking 12 or more units; only 9% were taking six units or less (See Table 2.). These percents contrast markedly with the 23.3% full-time and 76.7% part-time distribution of all Spring 1985 District (day and evening) students.

TABLE 1

ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS, ALL DISTRICT STUDENTS, AND FALL 1984 DISTRICT TRANSFERS

	Ethnicity (in Percents)			
Group	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White
Survey Respondents	18.2	3.6	13.4	60.0
All District Students *	8.9	4.2	9.9	72.7
Fall 1984 Transfers **	9.1	2.1	7.4	79.1

TABLE 2

UNITS TAKEN BY SURVEY RESPONDENTS

Units	Students
0-6	264 (8.9%)
7-11	703 (23.6%)
12 or more	2010 (67.5%)

* Selected Statistics, First Census - Spring 1985, Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges

** Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics, CPEC, Fall 1984, Appendix B

Significant Characteristics of Transfer Students

Of the 2983 Spring 1985 students who were surveyed in District day English or math classes, 76% intend to transfer. Of the 2275 transfer aspirants, 59% were under 23 years and enrolled for 12 or more units (74% of all the transfer aspirants were taking 12 or more units) and 75% started in the District as full-time students (12 or more units). The relatively large number of young full-time students enrolled in English or math classes is especially significant in light of the California Community College Board of Governors' major finding that "younger students enrolled full-time at community colleges are three times more likely to intend to transfer than are older students enrolled part-time" and that "nearly half of the potential pool (first-time, full-time, less than 25 year old enrollment) transfers to UC or CSU two years after entering lower division at a community college" (ref: Chuck McIntyre, Information on Transfer Education, Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, Oct 25-26, 1984). The Board's finding is well supported by the results of this survey in which 85% of potential transfers plan to transfer by 1987 (65% by 1986).

The percent of transfer aspirants among the survey respondents was highest at CSM (80%) and Canada College (80%) and lowest at Skyline College (68%). A majority of all ethnicities expressed an intent to transfer; thus, 80% of Asians, 80% of Caucasians, 76% of Blacks, and 70% of Hispanics do plan to transfer. Similarly, 83% of the male respondents and 77% of the female respondents plan to transfer. Only 21% of the transfer aspirants were not working; over 44% were working more than 20 hours per week. Very few (8%)

of those intending to transfer were receiving money from a financial aid program. Roughly one-fourth of the transfer aspirants do not intend to obtain an AA or AS degree while an additional one-fifth are undecided.

About two-thirds (64%) of the transfer aspirants intend to transfer to CSU, 25% to UC and the remaining 11% to a private California or out-of-state college or university. According to CPEC, since 1977 UC has received only 16% of all District transfers to UC or CSU (ref: Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics, CPEC, Fall 1984); yet 28% of survey respondents who indicated an intent to transfer to either UC or CSU opted for UC. This may mean that our potential transfer students are somewhat unrealistic in their expectations. About 45% of those who intend to transfer to UC plan to major in science or engineering; yet almost all of the UC engineering programs are impacted. Conversely, 38% of those who intend to transfer to CSU plan to major in business, and relatively few CSU business undergraduate programs are impacted (ref: CSU School and College Review, Oct 1985). Another possibility is that UC is inadvertently undercounting the number of community college transfer students. The Los Rios Community College District, in a follow-up study of its Fall 1980 transfers to UC Davis or CSU Sacramento, noted that its UCD and CSU transfers were undercounted by 41% and 11%, respectively (ref: Moving On: A Pilot Study of Student Transfer, Los Rios CC District).

Regardless of whether the student plans to transfer to UC, CSU, private California school, or out-of-state institution, at least 81% of the students plan to transfer by 1987. The chosen four-year major, however, is dependent

upon the institution to which the student intends to transfer. Thus, while science or engineering is the choice of 45% of UC transfers, business is the major selected by most (33%) of those students interested in transferring to one of the other three types of four-year schools. Engineering was the second choice (25%) of these latter students and business was the second choice (24%) of UC aspirants.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This survey identified 2275 potential transfers among Spring 1985 day English or math students. Of these students, 25% intend to transfer to UC, 64% intend to transfer to CSU and the remaining 11% plan to attend either a California private or out-of-state four-year school. Aspiration to transfer was high among all ethnicities and at all District campuses. Since almost two-thirds of the transfer aspirants were young, full-time students, at least one-half of them should transfer within two years of their enrollment within the District. The primary intended four-year majors of these transfers will be business; their second choice of major is science or engineering. Three-fourths of the potential transfers started their education in the District as full-time students. Most of these potential transfers work more than 20 hours per week; very few receive any funds from a financial aid program.

A total of 555 potential transfers to UC was identified in the survey; this total is higher than the total of 467 District transfers to UC reported by CPEC for the three fall semesters prior to the Spring 1985 survey. Similarly,

the 1421 District potential transfers to CSU identified in the survey exceeds the number of transfers reported by CPEC for any one year. Thus, the survey of day English and math students has identified a large number of potential UC or CSU transfers. The 261 students who plan to transfer to private or out-of-state four-year schools constitute a potential transfer population which has not been represented by CPEC or any other organization which counts transfer students.

It is recommended that the survey questionnaire be modified to include the specific four-year school to which a student intends to transfer. The survey should then be administered at least every fall semester, and lists of potential transfer students should be sent to those four-year schools which receive a significant number of our transfer students (UC Berkeley, SFSU, SJSU, etc.). These lists could greatly facilitate the matriculation of District transfer students. A similar list could be sent to any private California college or university which was chosen by an appreciable number of potential transfers.

It is recommended that consideration be given to surveying students other than those enrolled in English or math courses. In particular, students enrolled in vocational programs should be surveyed to ascertain their transfer aspirations.

Follow-up studies of identified potential transfer students should be conducted. The District could thus more accurately determine the percent of potential transfers who actually do transfer, when they transfer, and where

they transfer. The District could also determine more precisely how their students perform academically at four-year schools, both in terms of GPAs earned and graduation rates attained. The follow-up studies could also provide an assessment by former students of the efficacy of the District's transfer function and recommendations for its improvement.

APPENDIX A Course: _____ _____ _____
Name No. Code

SMCCCD STUDENT SURVEY

Name: _____ Soc. Sec. No. _____-___-_____
Last, First

The purpose of this survey is to provide the San Mateo County Community College District with information about its students. If you have taken this survey in another class, do not take it again. Please mark only one answer to each question and place your letter answer in the space provided on the left.

___ 1. At which District campus are you completing this survey?
A. CSM B. Canada C. Skyline

___ 2. If you are taking this survey in a Math class, which one?
A. 800-812 B. 110-115 C. 120-220 D. 241-275 E. none

___ 3. If you are taking this survey in an English class, which one?
A. 800-880 B. 100-210 C. 311-314 D. 411-430 E. none

___ 4. What is your sex?
A. Male B. Female

___ 5. What is your age?
A. under 18 B. 18-22 C. 23-29 D. 30-49 E. over 49

___ 6. What is your ethnic background?
A. Asian B. Black C. Hispanic D. White E. Other

___ 7. How many hours are you working on a job per week?
A. None B. 1-20 C. 21-40 D. over 40

___ 8. Are you receiving funds from a financial aid program?
A. Yes B. No

___ 9. How many units are you taking this semester?
A. 0-6 B. 7-11 C. 12 or more

___ 10. How many units have you completed in this District?
A. None B. 1-15 C. 16-30 D. 31-60 E. over 60

___ 11. Have you ever attended a four-year college or university?
A. Yes B. No

****
PLEASE COMPLETE REVERSE SIDE
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

___ 12. How many units have you completed at a four-year college or university?
A. None B. 1-15 C. 16-30 D. 31-60 E. over 60

___ 13. Do you plan to earn an AA or AS degree?
A. Yes B. No C. Undecided

___ 14. Do you plan to transfer to a four-year school?
A. Yes B. No. C. Undecided

IF YOU DO PLAN TO TRANSFER, PLEASE COMPLETE QUESTIONS 15-20

___ 15. To which type of campus do you plan to transfer (CSU indicates a California State University, i.e., S.F. State, San Jose State, etc.)

A. UC B. CSU C. Private CA. Univ. D. Out of State

___ 16. When do you plan to transfer?

A. 1985 B. 1986 C. 1987 D. 1988 E. Do not know

___ 17. In what field do you plan to earn a four-year degree?

A. Business B. Science/Engineering C. Social Science
D. Humanities E. Other

___ 18. Were you eligible to attend a four-year school upon graduation from high school?

A. Yes B. No C. Do not know

___ 19. Did you first attend a District campus as a full-time student (12 or more units) under 25 years of age?

A. Yes B. No

20. Using the numbers 1, 2 or 3, rate the following reasons why you came to a community college before attending a four-year college or university (1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = not important).

___ Satisfy transfer requirements

___ Reputation of community college

___ Cost

___ Location

___ Undecided about my educational goals

___ Apprehensive about attending a four-year college or university

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges APR 2 4 1986